



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/750,318	12/30/2003	Jae-Geun Oh	00939H-087500US	1692
20350	7590	11/29/2005		EXAMINER
TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP				WILSON, CHRISTIAN D
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER				
EIGHTH FLOOR			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834				2891

DATE MAILED: 11/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/750,318	OH ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Christian Wilson	2891	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 September 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 23 December 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 00222005 6-16-2005
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Official Notice***

1. Official notice is taken that the gradient of a scalar function is mathematically equivalent to the slope of the function. This statement is supported by the reference, *CRC Standard Mathematical Tables and Formulae*.

Official notice is taken that higher energy ions are necessary to penetrate an overlying screening layer since the ions loose energy within the layer. This statement is supported by the references *Silicon Processing for the VLSI Era* and *Electronic Materials Science*.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1 – 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tran *et al.* in view of Fischer *et al.*

Regarding claims 1, 2, and 6, Tran *et al.* (US 6,759,288) teaches a method for forming plugs on active regions of a semiconductor device comprising the steps of forming a plurality of gate lines **16** on a substrate **12**, implanting a first dopant **25** using the gate lines as a mask [column 11, line 10] to form a plurality of cell junctions **202** with gate lines formed between the cell junctions, forming a buffer layer **72** over the cell junctions, implanting a second dopant **26**

under the buffer layer, where the concentration profile has a reduced slope which suppresses the width of the depletion layer [column 12, lines 10-15; column 10, lines 30-40] and the buffer layer intrinsically enables a higher implantation energy, as described by Wolf (*Silicon Processing for the VLSI Era*). Tran *et al.* teaches implanting a second dopant with the same conductivity type but not necessarily of a different energy or forming a well implantation. Fischer *et al.* (US 6,693,014) teaches forming cell junctions with a second implantation that has a higher energy than the first implantation [Figure 6] and a well implantation formed before the cell and plug implantations [column 2, lines 1-10]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the implantation energies and well implantation of Fischer *et al.* in the method of Tran *et al.* since the higher implant energy provides a device with improved static refresh performance and the well implantation is a standard MOSFET design for improving DRAM device performance.

Regarding claim 3, Tran *et al.* further teaches a phosphorus implantation with a dose range of  $5 \times 10^{11}$  to  $5 \times 10^{12}$  ions/cm<sup>2</sup> with an energy of 30 – 100 KeV [column 8, lines 1-5].

Regarding claim 4, Tran *et al.* further teaches an energy distribution applied in several sets [Figure 16].

Regarding claim 5, Tran *et al.* does not discuss several sets of increasing energy from a high level to a low level. Fischer *et al.* teaches an ion implantation method where several sets of dopants are implanted with increasing energy from a high level to a low level [Figure 6]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the implantation method of Fischer *et al.* in the method of Tran *et al.* since this method improves the threshold voltage of the resulting device.

Regarding claim 7, Tran *et al.* further teaches a nitride layer with a thickness of 30 – 200 Å [column 11, lines 30-45].

Regarding claim 8, Tran *et al.* further teaches N type dopants [column 11, lines 25 and 55].

Regarding claim 9, Tran *et al.* further teaches forming a spacer by etching the buffer layer [Figure 23], forming an interlayer insulation layer **32, 34**, forming a plurality of contact holes [Figure 23], and forming a plurality of contact plugs **82**.

Regarding claim 10, Tran *et al.* teaches a method for forming plugs on active regions of a semiconductor device comprising the steps of forming a plurality of gate lines **16** on a substrate **12**, forming a plurality of cell junctions **202** by ion implanting a first dopant **25** using the gate lines as a mask [column 11, line 10], forming a buffer layer **72**, and forming a plurality of plug regions **212** by ion implanting a second dopant **26** under the buffer layer, where the concentration profile has a reduced slope [column 12, lines 10-15] and the buffer layer intrinsically enables a higher implantation energy, as described by Wolf (*Silicon Processing for the VLSI Era*). Tran *et al.* does not teach forming a well implantation. Fischer *et al.* teaches forming a well implantation formed before the cell and plug implantations [column 2, lines 1-10]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the well implantation of Fischer *et al.* in the method of Tran *et al.* since the well implantation is a standard MOSFET design for improving DRAM device performance.

Regarding claim 11, Tran *et al.* further teaches a blanket implantation for forming the plug region [Figure 22]. Tran *et al.* teaches implanting a second dopant with the same conductivity type but not necessarily of a different energy. Fischer *et al.* teaches forming cell

junctions with a second implantation that has a higher energy than the first implantation [Figure 6]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the implantation energies of Fischer *et al.* in the method of Tran *et al.* since the higher implant energy provides a device with improved static refresh performance.

Regarding claim 12, Tran *et al.* further teaches a phosphorus implantation with a dose range of  $5 \times 10^{11}$  to  $5 \times 10^{12}$  ions/cm<sup>2</sup> with an energy of 30 – 100 KeV [column 8, lines 1-5] where the first and second dopants have the same conductivity.

Regarding claim 13, Tran *et al.* further teaches an energy distribution applied in several sets [Figure 16] with the same dopant type.

Regarding claim 14, Tran *et al.* does not discuss several sets of increasing energy from a high level to a low level. Fischer *et al.* teaches an ion implantation method where several sets of dopants are implanted with increasing energy from a high level to a low level [Figure 6]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the implantation method of Fischer *et al.* in the method of Tran *et al.* since this method improves the threshold voltage of the resulting device.

Regarding claims 15 and 16, Tran *et al.* further teaches a nitride layer with a thickness of 30 – 200 Å [column 11, lines 30-45] where the reduced slope of the ion concentration suppresses the width of the depletion layer [column 12, lines 10-15; column 10, lines 30-40].

Regarding claim 17, Tran *et al.* further teaches N type dopants [column 11, lines 25 and 55].

Regarding claim 18, Tran *et al.* further teaches forming a spacer by etching the buffer layer [Figure 23], forming an interlayer insulation layer **32, 34**, forming a plurality of contact holes [Figure 23], and forming a plurality of contact plugs **82**.

Regarding claims 19 and 20, Tran *et al.* teaches a method for forming plugs on active regions of a semiconductor device comprising the steps of forming a plurality of gate lines **16** on a substrate **12**, implanting a first dopant **25** using the gate lines as a mask [column 11, line 10] to form a plurality of cell junctions **202** with gate lines formed between the cell junctions, forming a buffer layer **72** over the cell junctions, implanting a second dopant **26** under the buffer layer, where the concentration profile has a reduced slope which suppresses the width of the depletion layer [column 12, lines 10-15; column 10, lines 30-40] and the buffer layer intrinsically enables a higher implantation energy, as described by Wolf (*Silicon Processing for the VLSI Era*). Tran *et al.* teaches implanting a second dopant with the same conductivity type but not necessarily of a different energy or forming a well implantation. Fischer *et al.* teaches forming cell junctions with a second implantation that has a higher energy than the first implantation [Figure 6] and a well implantation formed before the cell and plug implantations of a second conductivity type [column 2, lines 1-10]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the implantation energies and well implantation of Fischer *et al.* in the method of Tran *et al.* since the higher implant energy provides a device with improved static refresh performance and the well implantation is a standard MOSFET design for improving DRAM device performance.

***Response to Arguments***

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 10 have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

***Conclusion***

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christian Wilson whose telephone number is (571) 272-1886. The examiner can normally be reached on weekdays, 7:30 AM to 4 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bill Baumeister can be reached on (571) 272-1722. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



CDW  
Christian Wilson, Ph.D.  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2891

CDW